

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE CONFIRMATION NO. 10/773,542 02/06/2004 Qiwei He 3057.NWN 6471 **EXAMINER** 03/23/2005 Cynthia L. Foulke HARLAN, ROBERT D NATIONAL STARCH AND CHEMICAL COMPANY PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT 10 Finderne Avenue Bridgewater, NJ 08807-0500 1713

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary	10/773,542	HE ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Robert D. Harlan	1713		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	86(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirwithin the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status	•			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_•			
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the application.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are rejected.				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•			
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive	on No		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	* **	ed.		
2	2 222 335			
Attachment(s)				
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary			
2)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)		
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over vanDrongelen et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,103,814 (hereinafter "vanDrongelen"). VanDrongelen teaches a hot-melt adhesive composition suitable for the manufacture of soft goods.

Art Unit: 1713

VanDrongelen further teaches that the hot-melt adhesives comprising styrene block copolymers, tackifiers, and properties (e.g. creep performance, viscosity) within the teachings of the present claims. See vanDrongelen, Examples. Although vanDrongelen does not disclose all the characteristics and properties disclosed in the present claims, based on a broad interpretation, the Examiner has a reasonable basis to believe that the properties claimed in the present invention is inherent in the hot melt adhesive disclosed by vanDrongelen. Because the PTO has no means to conduct analytical experiments, the burden of proof is shifted to the Applicants to prove that the properties are not inherent. See In re Fitzgerald, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980); In re Best, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977); In re Napier, 55 F.3d 610, 613, 34 USPQ2d 1782, 1784 (Fed. Cir. 1995).

4. The claiming of a new use, new function or unknown property which is inherently present in the prior art doe not necessary make the claim patentable. <u>In re Best</u>, 562 F.2d 1252, 1254, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). However, the fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic. <u>See In re Rijckaert</u>, 9 F.3d. 1531, 1534, 28

Art Unit: 1713

USPQ2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (reversed rejection because inherency was based on what would result due to optimization of conditions, not what was necessary due to optimization of conditions, not what was necessarily present in the prior art). "To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing describe in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient.'" <u>See In re Robertson</u>, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51. "In relying upon the theory of inherency, the examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied prior art." Ex parte Levy, 17 USPQ2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990).

5. Even if the disclosure of vanDrongelen does not satisfy the requirements of 35 USC 102(b), it still would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the claimed hot melt adhesive, because it appears that the claimed adhesives and

Application/Control Number: 10/773,542

Art Unit: 1713

articles made therefrom are within the generic disclosure of vanDrongelen and a person of ordinary skill in the art would have expected all embodiment of vanDrongelen to have similar properties. Applicant has not demonstrated that the differences, if any, between the claimed adhesives and the hot melts disclosed by vanDrongelen give rise to unexpected results. The evidence presented to rebut the prima facie case of obviousness must be commensurate in scope with the claims to which it pertains. See In re Dill and Scales, 202 USPQ 805 (CCPA 1979).

Page 5

Conclusion

- 6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert D. Harlan whose telephone number is (571) 272-1102. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 10 AM 8 PM.
- 7. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David W. Wu can be reached on (571) 273-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/773,542

Art Unit: 1713

Page 6

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert D. Harlan Primary Examiner Art Unit 1713

rdh